

The Sun

SATURDAY, AUGUST 26, 1905.

Entered at the Post Office at New York as Second Class Matter.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid.

DAILY, Per Month, \$2.00
DAILY, Per Year, \$20.00
SUNDAY, Per Year, \$5.00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year, \$25.00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month, \$2.50Postage to foreign countries added.
Readers who intend to leave town for the summer may have THE SUN mailed to them at the foregoing price. The address may be changed as is desired. Order through your newsdealer or of THE SUN, 170 Nassau street.

Published by The Sun Printing and Publishing Association, at 170 Nassau street, in the Borough of Manhattan, New York.

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts for publication wish to have rejected articles returned, they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

Divers Views of an Anglo-Franco-American Understanding.

The suggestion that the peace of the world might be powerfully promoted, if not permanently assured, by a cordial understanding which should contemplate cooperation in certain contingencies on the part of the United States, Great Britain and France has been received with considerable satisfaction by some French and British newspapers and has been deemed worthy of discussion by some of our esteemed contemporaries on this side of the Atlantic. There are obvious reasons why it should be welcomed less promptly and effusively in our own country, which has not yet entirely adjusted to, or as the French say, oriented itself to the new international relations to which our growth in wealth and population and our acquisition of transmarine dependencies are irresistibly compelling us.

If narrow and selfish interests are chiefly to be considered it may be admitted that England would at first sight have most to gain by the suggested combination. By Britons themselves it is acknowledged that for their island kingdom absolute mastery of the sea is the sole palladium of safety. In no other way could such mastery be so improbably established as through the formation of an intimate friendship with France and the United States. With such an invincible armada as these three Powers could put upon the ocean it would be impossible, now or ever, for the rest of the world to cope. The mere knowledge that the three Powers named would act together for reciprocal defense, as well as for the furtherance of far reaching philanthropic purposes, would suffice to discourage all other countries from progressive outlay on their fleets and thus effectually stop the tendency on the part of the League of Friendship also to ruinous expenditure on naval armaments. Many warships England must doubtless have, if only for the protection of her globe encircling commerce, until the millennium is much nearer than it is now, but she would naturally like to perform the policing of the seas as cheaply as possible. A reasonable limit to her naval disbursements could soon be fixed if she were able to rely in time of need on the assistance of the French and American navies. It is not only the fear of an invasion that Englishmen desire to see dispelled, but also the dread lest the regular conveyance of their food supplies from transmarine purveyors should be interrupted even temporarily. They would cease to be haunted by either of those misgivings were the species of coral coalition which has been mooted to be brought about.

Next to England, it must be owned that France would derive directly most advantage from the triune understanding proposed. She would therefrom have the assurance that under no circumstances could she be deprived of her colonies in Algeria, central Africa and Indo-China, in which she has invested vast amounts of capital and from which she hopes for adequate returns. Nor is that the only benefit that would accrue to Frenchmen from an Anglo-Franco-American understanding. The wealth of France, great as it is, is materially less than that of Great Britain and still more inferior to that of the United States. By a league of friendship with the two countries which alone are richer than herself she would secure for her own Government and without from her enemies access to at least three-fourths of the world's accumulated treasure. The knowledge that France in an emergency could depend upon being backed by the omnipotence of the purse would safeguard her against aggression on the part of Germany or any other Power and knit indissolubly the ties of interest by which Russia is already bound to her. The truth of course is that, in view of the appalling cost of modern warfare, all talk of a quarrel with any member of the suggested triple combination would have to be renounced at Berlin, at Tokio and at St. Petersburg. Everywhere peace would necessarily prevail, simply because the sinews of war would thenceforth be unobtainable.

In such a consummation will be recognized, soon or late, the principal ground on which an Anglo-Franco-American understanding may commend itself to our own people. There are among us a few conservatives who would rather have us abandon the Philippines, Hawaii, Porto Rico and the Panama Canal strip than see us impelled by exigencies inseparable from transmarine dependencies to put aside the prudent maxima of aloofness and isolation by which our republic in the days of its infancy and feebleness was guided. There are others who would look on such a course as entirely unworthy of a high hearted and puissant people, as a pusillanimous avoidance of responsibilities and opportunities, and who hold that any definite and lasting understanding with foreign Powers would be superfluous; that sufficient unto the day is the trouble thereof, and that if at any time our possessions were put in jeopardy it would be easy for us, should our own strength seem inadequate, to find an efficient ally.

The assumption takes a good deal for granted. It implies that occasion, which waits for no man, will always be ready to our hand. Some self-complacent Americans remind us of the doughty Welshman who boasted that he could "call spirits from the vasty deep." "Hotsprings" is as pertinent as ever: "But will they come when you do call for them?"

It might or might not prove to be a fact, amid the possible future complexities of international relations, that the young and fair American Republic would only have to smile assent to any of many suitors for her favor. It is, on the other hand, quite possible that Columbia might outstay her market and find herself forced to abide in compulsory and sterile spinsterhood. Be that as it may, it does not become us to debate the advisability of an Anglo-Franco-American understanding on grounds of self-interest alone. There is a duty to mankind, a duty commensurate with the might and majesty to which we are predestined. Soon or late we shall all of us awaken to the sacredness of the debt we owe to the brotherhood of man, and then the high obligation will be splendidly discharged.

Shaw Scores Against Fairbanks.

How large is the cabman vote? It must be great in the aggregate. Perhaps the cabmen could control a national election if they stood together. The Hon. LESLIE M. SHAW has won that vote, won it by a single act, won it in a single evening.

Secretary SHAW, alighting from a train at Denison, in the State he honors by calling his, found only one night hawk at the station, or, as the Iowans say, the "deopot." The driver of this lonely conveyance was sleeping the sleep of the just, perched on his high seat, when the Secretary espied him. To waken this skilled navigator of Denison's highways and byways would have been a cruelty. Secretary SHAW is a kind man. He clambered to the seat, planted himself beside the driver and held the reins until he reached his destination. Then Mr. SHAW awakened his cabman, paid his fare and went his way.

Would Mr. FAIRBANKS of Indiana thus treat a sleeping cabman? Mr. FAIRBANKS is a many sided man. It would be unwise to say what he would or would not do under similar circumstances. The point is that he has not done it. He has ridden in an engine cab, but his presence there relieved the engineer of none of his responsibilities. Although Mr. FAIRBANKS endured the heat and wind and dust of the locomotive, after all he was but a passenger. Mr. SHAW worked his way. He showed his oneness with the worker, his tenderness for the toiler.

The cabman vote is consolidated and solidified for SHAW. "SHAW and Shum-bert" is the slogan. The Secretary of the Treasury has made a master stroke. The dwellers in other spheres, who can see more plainly than earth's people the topest pinnacle of CHARLES WARREN FAIRBANKS, report that his hair is curling. Envy has done it. He has lost the cabman vote to the Hon. LESLIE MORTIMER SHAW of Iowa.

The Public and Private Ethical Standard.

Mr. ALFRED HEMENWAY of Boston, in an address before the American Bar Association on Thursday, spoke with proper severity of the cant of the day that "commercialism" has entered into the learned professions and has lowered their ethical standards.

It is true that the growth of this country in wealth and in the complexity of its civilization has necessitated a corresponding development of the legal profession which has been both broadening and specializing. Lawyers are dealing with vastly larger affairs than formerly, growing out of the great corporate evolution of this period, and questions which concern the management and relations of vast aggregations of capital bring them into prominent association with "commercialism," as it is called. This association, however, is not new except as affects the far greater magnitude of the interests involved. Always and necessarily the lawyer was preeminently an adjunct and adviser in business undertakings. The great bulk of the practice of lawyers has always been "commercial," in the sense that it concerned the dealings in which men engaged for money making—in trade and barter and the conflicts and controversies arising out of them. The only difference now is that the interests involved are larger and the introduction of new business methods has multiplied and made more difficult the questions requiring legal counsel and judicial decision. The principles of law and equity to be applied are similar if the sum in dispute is \$5 or \$5,000,000.

The current accusation of "commercialism" is due primarily to larger emoluments obtained by the lawyer at the present time. A capital income from legal practice two generations ago in New York was \$10,000 a year. Now it is probably ten times as much; yet, relatively to the value of the interests involved in the matters referred to the lawyer for advice and settlement, the present income is no greater—nay, is less. Relatively to the incomes made in trade and in the management of large business enterprises, it is not large. Business men have been in the habit of regarding as excessive a professional income not equal to that which they take as a matter of course in the commercial world. Incomes from the practice of the most distinguished lawyers and physicians are spoken of as surprising and almost extortionate gains, though hundreds and thousands of men of affairs get more by the expenditure of less special ability.

Mr. HEMENWAY met the accusation of the degradation of the legal profession by "commercialism" by declaring specifically and emphatically that the profession "is broader than ever before; its ethics more exacting"; and he extended the assertion to include all the learned professions. It is a generalization justified by the facts. The lawyer, the physician, the clergyman, the engineer

who might have been distinguished for his qualifications in the past would now find himself overmastered. Doubtless the methods of the present are less formal. The professional man has become more nearly akin in his bearing to the man of business. The old fashioned lawyer and doctor have given place to practitioners who are too much occupied with essentials to give heed to the mere professional formalities of the past.

Mr. HEMENWAY might have gone further and said that generally the ethical standard applied to persons in large places of trust has been elevated. This is true of politics, of society and of business. The present criticism of loose or corrupt practices in Government and in corporations is due to this greater moral elevation. The public conscience is more sensitive concerning the conduct and methods of men in places of trust, public and private.

Forestry.

A million dollar fire in a lumber yard excites public attention and comment from Maine to California. Few pay any attention to the \$25,000,000 worth of lumber annually destroyed in the United States by forest fires. The price of beef, gas and railway rates is a permanent topic of active discussion and controversy. Few give any heed to the recent enormous increase in the cost of lumber or to the danger of an early exhaustion of our forest resources.

This general indifference cannot be attributed to the insignificance of wood as an item in our industrial economy. The value of our lumber and timber products for 1900 is given in the census report as \$668,621,755. We assume that this covers only such articles as logs, joists, planks, boards, etc., in mill yard and lumber yard. The value of the products of the forest, in their final and finished state, in all their multifarious forms, whether consumed as fuel or manufactured into furniture, wagons and carriages, railway cars, house cabinet work, lead pencils, matches or toothpicks, is quite impossible to estimate. If steel billets or Bessemer iron were to advance 10 per cent, the fact would excite widespread comment. The prices of lumber have advanced within recent years, according to the nature of the wood and the probable continuance of supply, from 20 to 70 per cent. Few pay any attention to this, though every person in the country is more or less affected by it. In his message of December, 1903, President ROOSEVELT had more to say about the preservation of our forests than about anti-trust laws. Addressing the American Forest Congress, last January, Mr. ROOSEVELT said: "If the present rate of forest destruction is allowed to continue, with nothing to offset it, a timber famine in the future is inevitable." We quote this, not because the President is the final expert authority on the subject, but because his statement expresses concisely a fact recognized by all experts.

From this point of view it is most interesting to learn from the year book of the Department of Agriculture that "the year 1904 saw a large gain in the popular acceptance and application of the principles which govern the proper care and use of wood lands." In his address to the Forest Congress Mr. ROOSEVELT took the ground that our lumbermen have heretofore regarded forest experts and those interested in forest preservation as faddists whose idea is to treat our forests as a kind of bribe-a-brac. The Bureau of Forestry now reports that land owners and great lumber concerns, Western stockmen and miners are coming to understand that conservative forest management means dollars and cents directly to them.

Eleven States now have some form of forest administration. Colleges and universities are turning to forestry as a line of special study. Yale and Harvard and the University of Michigan have their forest schools, and an increasing attendance is reported. The management of interest and practical activity is encouraging.

In a letter to the president of the Forest Congress last winter Mr. JAMES J. HILL said: "Irrigation and forestry are the two subjects which are to have a greater effect upon the future prosperity of the United States than any other public question, either within or without Congress." It is seldom that so great a truth is so tersely stated.

Private Utilities.

In resolutions resonant with the old Roman integrity of their source, Mr. ODELL's New York city and county committee has highly resolved for "an administration of the affairs of the city under which the public utility corporations will not be the masters of the people of the city."

A public utility corporation which is of no private utility to the Boss fills that righteous soul with grief and indignation. Let but the good man in among these soulless corporations, and what a change you will see! With a spotless purity of purpose, with an eye single to the good of the beloved public, the GALAHAD of financial politics will ride down those paynim cauldrons and appropriate their armor, the spoils of war.

Why not? The "goods" to the good man; and if the Hon. BENJAMIN DARRER ODELL, Jr., isn't a good man to deprive corporations of their ill gotten gains, who is?

The Couchant Smoker.

The other day we celebrated modestly but firmly the joy of reading in bed, and added to Dr. ODELL's prescription thereof another and a still more salutary simple. Bed, book, cigar; and the greatest of these is the last. He who knows not in combination these three elements of intellectual and physical comfort, this triple alliance of the kingdoms of ease, he knows you not, you heavenly powers!

Mr. CHARLES B. WHITING of Hartford has lifted the only voice yet given against the bad three. He has proposed fireproof bedgear for the couchant smoker-reader. As if the mere fact of having a fire in your pipe or cigar or cigarette were not enough to keep the reader-smoker's vigilance subconsciously awake,

the only peril to be apprehended is that the weed you are smoking may go out. In cold weather this is particularly annoying. We have seen couchant smoker-readers of so acute and trained a perception that they fall asleep the moment the cigar is out. It falls as soft as down, yet the trained sleeper awakes and doth that light rumble. Besides, persons given to read in bed are of that quiet conscience that has no reason to be afraid of fire. At worst, out of the nettle danger they pluck the flower safely.

This letter, with its friendly and informal address, supports us in the cause of right and should be profitable for reproof and righteousness to our Hartford friend:

"DEAR OLD SUN: Mr. WHITING has added nothing to your comment on the Oler theory of reading in bed. I know. I've tried it for the past ten months. You can read and smoke in bed without asbestos bedclothes or in pajamas. Possibly a cigarette smoker might set himself on fire, but a cigar and this Sun are safe to smoke and read in bed. Smokes, WATKINS. Try a cigar!"

"NOWHICH, N.Y., Aug. 24. AN ISRAELITE."

Try a cigar! There's the rub. Is it not a fact that Mr. WHITING has "sworn off" for a month? The word "cigar" is odious to him. He balks in the light of his new halo. He loves to dwell upon the noble resolution of little ROBERT REED. When the first of September comes he will stay himself once more with the holy herb nicotine. He will wrap the drapery of his couch about him—weather permitting—puff placidly and devote to the dark underground all counterbalancers, all foes of the tranquil brotherhood of human chimneys and smoke absorbers.

Smoking in bed is more healthful than health, safer than safety. In a million of years, if one smoker out of billions should perish of his own flames, what of it? Euthanasia. He will die like a rose in aromatic pain, like a phoenix on his spiny pyre.

MAYOR EDWARD F. DUNNE of Chicago, in his address to the League of American Municipalities, said with great solemnity: "Municipal ownership of public utilities is a sole dream."

To this Mayor WOODWARD of Atlanta, Ga., replied that Mayor DUNNE was "making a play to the people for their votes." Mr. WOODWARD appears to hold original and hardly commendable ideas as to personal dignity, but, in spite of his peculiarities, he is at least able to tell a hawk from a hand-saw.

The result of the Virginia primary election held on Tuesday has discredited, in the home of its friends, a cherished notion of politics and the delight of many professional reformers; the popular election of United States Senators.

"We favor the election of United States Senators by a direct vote of the people," declared the Democratic national convention in St. Louis thirteen months ago.

"Let the people elect their Senators," has been the burden of the demand of Socialists, Populists and Social Democrats everywhere. Last year at Indianapolis the Prohibitionists adopted the following resolution:

"We declare ourselves in favor of the election of United States Senators by popular vote."

Senator MARTIN of Alabama is the Virginia Senator whose term will expire in March of 1907. He was elected by the Democratic members of the Richmond Legislature; he was the caucus or machine candidate.

The advocates of the popular election of United States Senators, who are numerous in Virginia, had their opportunity on Tuesday. Under the primary election law of that State every Democratic voter could declare—and the great majority of Democrats in Virginia, between the green hills and the great waters, did declare—their preference. It was the same as the preference of the caucus—the election of Senator MARTIN for another term.

Questions.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: Do you believe that humanity could survive if all drum majors were forthwith by law or removed from the earth?

Why do men uniformly stand motionless in all the narrow passages of life?

Is every man's child the most wonderful in the universe?

Is the smile of a waiter sincerely performed?

If nature had not furnished man with a nose, what arrangement would serve to hold glasses before the eyes of those with defective vision?

Is there anything dumber than a smart set?

Do you think salvation is possible for the man who plagues the calf of another's leg when ascending the stairs?

Do you think that extreme politeness toward a wife in public fully compensates her for the obligation to carry up the military cane and to assume the charge of the cab coat?

Ever meet a man of any mental consequence who demands the name of any fashionable man who assists in impelling the wheels of the world's progress?

Immediate replies requested. Going fishing shortly and want subjects for rumination between blue-and snipe. PHILADELPHIA.

NEW YORK, Aug. 25.

Singless New York.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: You are right, Mr. Gokley of Coney. I am a native of this city, born and bred, and have lived here most of my life, and yet I am daily embarrassed by the lack of street signs. The fact that the city of New York has no good system of street signs may well attract the criticism of the native as well as that of the stranger.

A few years ago we had seemingly a very good system of street signs and the signs were expensive and attractive. With the incoming of the present administration (and each administration seems to attack the street signs of its predecessor) these signs were removed and but few have been substituted for them. I saw in THE SUN (and it must be so about one year ago) that \$30,000 had been appropriated for street signs. There seems to be no sign of these signs of it as a "bushy" for plural, on what ground I have never known. SOUTHERN.

NEW YORK, Aug. 24.

Coming Events in Rockland and Flee Hill.

From the Fayetteville Observer.

The register of deaths granted the following marriage license last Saturday: Mr. Daniel R. Williams and Miss S. E. Nicks of Flee Hill; Mr. Nathan Hale and Miss Mary B. Thagard of Rockland.

The Stegomyia.

From St. Houston Post.

I am long and wicked and blind and stupid and I need you to help me.

I am long and wicked and blind and stupid and I need you to help me.

I am long and wicked and blind and stupid and I need you to help me.

I am long and wicked and blind and stupid and I need you to help me.

I am long and wicked and blind and stupid and I need you to help me.

I am long and wicked and blind and stupid and I need you to help me.

I am long and wicked and blind and stupid and I need you to help me.

I am long and wicked and blind and stupid and I need you to help me.

I am long and wicked and blind and stupid and I need you to help me.

I am long and wicked and blind and stupid and I need you to help me.

I am long and wicked and blind and stupid and I need you to help me.

I am long and wicked and blind and stupid and I need you to help me.

THE JEWS OF THE UNITED STATES.

Their Wealth as Computed by Dr. Isidore Singer—The Manchurian Project.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN—Sir: The Baltimore correspondent of the London Jewish Chronicle of Aug. 11 makes the following statement: "That the Jews of New York city have a combined wealth of over \$600,000,000, and that the trade in the hands of Jewish middlemen and manufacturers annually amounts to \$1,000,000,000, is not only true, but he prudently adds that he 'does not vouch for the figures and has no idea whence they were gathered.'"

The recent sending of bombs to Messrs. Wasserman and Guggenheim and, more yet, the publication of an anti-Semitic and anti-plutocratic letter of menace which had been, months ago, addressed to Philip Cohen, editor of the American Hebrew, by a "Mr. Probably," Russian anarchist of Jewish descent, and the bringing of Commissioner Meadlow into connection with these criminal attempts, make a closer study of the true financial situation of the Jews of this country a duty which is not only a merely politico-economic standpoint, but also with regard to the immigration problem and, in a wider sense, as an important element for the eventual solution of the Jewish question in this country.

There were about 350,000 Jews in the United States in 1900. The Jews in 1900. If Czar Alexander II. had not been blown up, with the evident connivance of the leaders of the reactionary party, the 15th of March of the year following but had been allowed to grant his people a genuine constitution and real liberty, his Jewish subjects would have remained in their fatherland, securing their own peace and contentment. The Jewish population of the United States, by natural increase augmented by another 50,000 or 60,000, would to-day have formed the bulk of the Jewish population of the United States.

Between 1921 and 1970 only 7,550 Jewish immigrants from the Russian pale itself and from Russian Poland came to this country, while of the Jewish immigrants from the other parts of the world, actually counted, from 1881 to 1903, more than 500,000 were Russians, since, according to the report of the United Hebrew Charities of New York, 406,487 of these Jews had arrived at this island alone between 1881 and October, 1903. In the same period 158,000 Jews had come from Austria, for the greater part from the poverty stricken province of Galicia; 84,000 Hungarians and 4,375 Rumanians arrived at the port of New York while England furnished only a quota of 2,735, Turkey (Palestine included), 1,534; Holland, 224; Sweden, 303; France, 334; Denmark, 225.

Of the 1,200,000 probable accumulated wealth of our Jewish population, 300,000 are the additional 1,200,000 newcomers? To give even approximate figures were a ridiculous attempt. But this much can, on general principles, be ascertained: A Jewish family living a minimum of twenty-five years in a prosperous and free country like ours either goes to the wall or mounts the economic ladder, at length reaching the "well to do" stage. We can further reasonably suppose that about 10 per cent. of the Russians, 15 per cent. of the Austrians and 25 per cent. of the Germans and British took the same flight during the last twenty-five years, so that there may be 575,000 individuals, or about 500,000 to do the Jewish families in the United States, the other 225,000 having yet to struggle for the earning of their daily bread.

How many Jewish millionaires are there from New York to San Francisco and from San Francisco to New York? Hardly a dozen, for if you have named Kuhn, Loeb & Co. (with its four or five partners), the Guggenheims, Seligmans, Lewishons of this city and two or three Jewish Croesus in the West, you have nearly exhausted the list as far as the wealth of a Jew may be computed from his contributions to Jewish charitable institutions. The fact that among the forty-odd princes of finance and industry who made up the Equitable board of directors there was only one Hebrew (Jacob H. Schiff) gives us the right clue as to the real participation of the Jews in the riches of this country.

It is not enough, in one of your editorials of last Sunday, to allude to my suggestion thrown out in my open letter to Mr. Witte as to the possibility of replacing the chimerical Palestinian plan of Jewish immigration by the more realistic and profitable one of the 6,000,000 of Russian Jews who are not only treated by their own Government in every regard with cruel harshness, but are literally starving to death. Would that a Jew who had seen the Russian Jews, instead of entertaining wild meant but useless purporting with Mr. Witte, might be induced to form a syndicate offering the same shrewd Russian statesman and financier, who has nearly exhausted the list as far as the wealth of a Jew may be computed from his contributions to Jewish charitable institutions. The fact that among the forty-odd princes of finance and industry who made up the Equitable board of directors there was only one Hebrew (Jacob H. Schiff) gives us the right clue as to the real participation of the Jews in the riches of this country.

It is not enough, in one of your editorials of last Sunday, to allude to my suggestion thrown out in my open letter to Mr. Witte as to the possibility of replacing the chimerical Palestinian plan of Jewish immigration by the more realistic and profitable one of the 6,000,000 of Russian Jews who are not only treated by their own Government in every regard with cruel harshness, but are literally starving to death. Would that a Jew who had seen the Russian Jews, instead of entertaining wild meant but useless purporting with Mr. Witte, might be induced to form a syndicate offering the same shrewd Russian statesman and financier, who has nearly exhausted the list as far as the wealth of a Jew may be computed from his contributions to Jewish charitable institutions. The fact that among the forty-odd princes of finance and industry who made up the Equitable board of directors there was only one Hebrew (Jacob H. Schiff) gives us the right clue as to the real participation of the Jews in the riches of this country.

It is not enough, in one of your editorials of last Sunday, to allude to my suggestion thrown out in my open letter to Mr. Witte as to the possibility of replacing the chimerical Palestinian plan of Jewish immigration by the more realistic and profitable one of the 6,000,000 of Russian Jews who are not only treated by their own Government in every regard with cruel harshness, but are literally starving to death. Would that a Jew who had seen the Russian Jews, instead of entertaining wild meant but useless purporting with Mr. Witte, might be induced to form a syndicate offering the same shrewd Russian statesman and financier, who has nearly exhausted the list as far as the wealth of a Jew may be computed from his contributions to Jewish charitable institutions. The fact that among the forty-odd princes of finance and industry who made up the Equitable board of directors there was only one Hebrew (Jacob H. Schiff) gives us the right clue as to the real participation of the Jews in the riches of this country.

It is not enough, in one of your editorials of last Sunday, to allude to my suggestion thrown out in my open letter to Mr. Witte as to the possibility of replacing the chimerical Palestinian plan of Jewish immigration by the more realistic and profitable one of the 6,000,000 of Russian Jews who are not only treated by their own Government in every regard with cruel harshness, but are literally starving to death. Would that a Jew who had seen the Russian Jews, instead of entertaining wild meant but useless purporting with Mr. Witte, might be induced to form a syndicate offering the same shrewd Russian statesman and financier, who has nearly exhausted the list as far as the wealth of a Jew may be computed from his contributions to Jewish charitable institutions. The fact that among the forty-odd princes of finance and industry who made up the Equitable board of directors there was only one Hebrew (Jacob H. Schiff) gives us the right clue as to the real participation of the Jews in the riches of this country.

It is not enough, in one of your editorials of last Sunday, to allude to my suggestion thrown out in my open letter to Mr. Witte as to the possibility of replacing the chimerical Palestinian plan of Jewish immigration by the more realistic and profitable one of the 6,000,000 of Russian Jews who are not only treated by their own Government in every regard with cruel harshness, but are literally starving to death. Would that a Jew who had seen the Russian Jews, instead of entertaining wild meant but useless purporting with Mr. Witte, might be induced to form a syndicate offering the same shrewd Russian statesman and financier, who has nearly exhausted the list as far as the wealth of a Jew may be computed from his contributions to Jewish charitable institutions. The fact that among the forty-odd princes of finance and industry who made up the Equitable board of directors there was only one Hebrew (Jacob H. Schiff) gives us the right clue as to the real participation of the Jews in the riches of this country.

It is not enough, in one of your editorials of last Sunday, to allude to my suggestion thrown out in my open letter to Mr. Witte as to the possibility of replacing the chimerical Palestinian plan of Jewish immigration by the more realistic and profitable one of the 6,000,000 of Russian Jews who are not only treated by their own Government in every regard with cruel harshness, but are literally starving to death. Would that a Jew who had seen the Russian Jews, instead of entertaining wild meant but useless purporting with Mr. Witte, might be induced to form a syndicate offering the same shrewd Russian statesman and financier, who has nearly exhausted the list as far as the wealth of a Jew may be computed from his contributions to Jewish charitable institutions. The fact that among the forty-odd princes of finance and industry who made up the Equitable board of directors there was only one Hebrew (Jacob H. Schiff) gives us the right clue as to the real participation of the Jews in the riches of this country.

It is not enough, in one of your editorials of last Sunday, to allude to my suggestion thrown out in my open letter to Mr. Witte as to the possibility of replacing the chimerical Palestinian plan of Jewish immigration by the more realistic and profitable one of the 6,000,000 of Russian Jews who are not only treated by their own Government in every regard with cruel harshness, but are literally starving to death. Would that a Jew who had seen the Russian Jews, instead of entertaining wild meant but useless purporting with Mr. Witte, might be induced to form a syndicate offering the same shrewd Russian statesman and financier, who has nearly exhausted the list as far as the wealth of a Jew may be computed from his contributions to Jewish charitable institutions. The fact that among the forty-odd princes of finance and industry who made up the Equitable board of directors there was only one Hebrew (Jacob H. Schiff) gives us the right clue as to the real participation of the Jews in the riches of this country.

It is not enough, in one of your editorials of last Sunday, to allude to my suggestion thrown out in my open letter to Mr. Witte as to the possibility of replacing the chimerical Palestinian plan of Jewish immigration by the more realistic and profitable one of the 6,000,000 of Russian Jews who are not only treated by their own Government in every regard with cruel harshness, but are literally starving to death. Would that a Jew who had seen the Russian Jews, instead of entertaining wild meant but useless purporting with Mr. Witte, might be induced to form a syndicate offering the same shrewd Russian statesman and financier, who has nearly exhausted the list as far as the wealth of a Jew may be computed from his contributions to Jewish charitable institutions. The fact that among the forty-odd princes of finance and industry who made up the Equitable board of directors there was only one Hebrew (Jacob H. Schiff) gives us the right clue as to the real participation of the Jews in the riches of this country.

It is not enough, in one of your editorials of last Sunday, to allude to my suggestion thrown out in my open letter to Mr. Witte as to the possibility of replacing the chimerical Palestinian plan of Jewish immigration by the more realistic and profitable one of the 6,000,000 of Russian Jews who are not only treated by their own Government in every regard with cruel harshness, but are literally starving to death. Would that a Jew who had seen the Russian Jews, instead of entertaining wild meant but useless purporting with Mr. Witte, might be induced to form a syndicate offering the same shrewd Russian statesman and financier, who has nearly exhausted the list as far as the wealth of a Jew may be computed from his contributions to Jewish charitable institutions. The fact that among the forty-odd princes of finance and industry who made up the Equitable board of directors there was only one Hebrew (Jacob H. Schiff) gives us the right clue as to the real participation of the Jews in the riches of this country.

It is not enough, in one of your editorials of last Sunday, to allude to my suggestion thrown out in my open letter to Mr. Witte as to the possibility of replacing the chimerical Palestinian plan of Jewish immigration by the more realistic and profitable one of the 6,000,000 of Russian Jews who are not only treated by their own Government in every regard with cruel harshness, but are literally starving to death. Would that a Jew who had seen the Russian Jews, instead of entertaining wild meant but useless purporting with Mr. Witte, might be induced to form a syndicate offering the same shrewd Russian statesman and financier, who has nearly exhausted the list as far as the wealth of a Jew may be computed from his contributions to Jewish charitable institutions. The fact that among the forty-odd princes of finance and industry who made up the Equitable board of directors there was only one Hebrew (Jacob H. Schiff) gives us the right clue as to the real participation of the Jews in the riches of this country.

It is not enough, in one of your editorials of last Sunday, to allude to my suggestion thrown out in my open letter to Mr. Witte as to the possibility of replacing the chimerical Palestinian plan of Jewish immigration by the more realistic and profitable one of the 6,000,000 of Russian Jews who are not only treated by their own Government in every regard with cruel harshness, but are literally starving to death. Would that a Jew who had seen the Russian Jews, instead of entertaining wild meant but useless purporting with Mr. Witte, might be induced to form a syndicate offering the same shrewd Russian statesman and financier, who has nearly exhausted the list as far as the wealth of a Jew may be computed from his contributions to Jewish charitable institutions. The fact that among the forty-odd princes of finance and industry who made up the Equitable board of directors there was only one Hebrew (Jacob H. Schiff) gives us the right clue as to the real participation of the Jews in the riches of this country.

It is not enough, in one of your editorials of last Sunday, to allude to my suggestion thrown out in my open letter